

FILED

AUG - 3 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)  
CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)  
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067  
Telephone: (415) 393-2000  
Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

LAW OFFICES OF LAUREL STANLEY, a  
California business entity, and WILLIAM  
CRONIN, a resident of Texas,

Plaintiffs,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

No. C-05-2858-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO CONTINUE FILING DATE  
FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT

IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR  
COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS:

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Plaintiffs Law Offices of Laurel Stanley and  
William Cronin and Defendant Intel Corporation hereby stipulate that Intel Corporation's  
response to Plaintiffs' complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned  
case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C.  
Section 1407 or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied. The parties  
request this extension of time to answer or otherwise respond because the plaintiffs in *Brauch, et*

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE RESPONSE DATE

1 *al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, have filed  
2 a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, and the  
3 above-styled action has been identified as a related action to that petition. As a result the  
4 outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly the schedule of this case.

5 This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just  
6 begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.

7 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.  
8 DATED: July \_\_\_\_, 2005

9 Bingham McCutchen LLP

10  
11 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
12 JOY K. FUYUNO  
13 Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation

14 DATED: July \_\_\_\_, 2005

15 The Furth Firm LLP

16  
17 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
18 ALEX C. TURAN  
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
20 Law offices of Laurel Stanley,  
21 and William Cronin

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE DATE**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 8/2, 2005

  
Honorable Marilyn Hall Patel  
United States District Judge